

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-16 are currently pending in this application. In the specification, paragraphs [0016] and [0024] have been amended to correct typographical errors. In the drawings, Figure 4 has been amended to conform with paragraph [0021] of the specification. No new matter has been introduced into the application by these amendments.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC §103**

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 USC § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Final Office Action asserts that the claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to convey possession of the invention, and makes a parenthetical reference to “the new specification,” but does not specify any claim features not adequately supported. It also rejects the claims “as based on a disclosure which is not enabling critical or essential to the practice of the invention, but not included in the claim(s) is not enabled by the disclosure.” Applicants understand this to be an assertion that the disclosure does not enable elements essential to the practice of the invention, but again, it does not specify any element not enabled. Applicants respectfully traverse these assertions. The amendments not entered were submitted in accordance with the requirements of 37 CFR 1.121(b), and should not have been characterized as a new specification. Applicants respectfully assert that the application is easily understood by one skilled in the art, and clearly conveys possession of the invention, having Figures and text which show and describe the invention in great detail. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite with specificity any claim feature deemed to be unclear or unsupported.

Alternatively, withdrawal of the 35 USC § 112, first paragraph rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-16 also stand rejected under 35 USC § 103 as being unpatentable over Widegren et al. (US Patent 6,621,793, hereinafter "Widegren") in view of Sen et al. (US Patent 6,708,034, hereinafter "Sen"). This rejection is essentially identical to the rejection presented in the First Office Action. Applicants are somewhat confused by the assertion in the Final Office Action that, "Applicant's arguments filed 6/10/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive", yet in the same paragraph it is stated, "Examiner will not response to arguments directed to the detail in specification which has been amended." Applicants respectfully assert that the arguments were directed to the claims, and not to the specification. Since the arguments were not responded to, and the claim rejections under 35 USC § 103 in the Final Office Action are substantially identical to the claim rejections under 35 USC § 103 in the First Office Action, Applicants respectfully note that it appears Applicant's arguments filed June 8, 2005 have in fact not been fully considered, and respectfully request that those arguments be responded to. Alternatively, withdrawal of the 35 USC § 103 rejection is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-16, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a

**Applicants:** Shaheen et al.  
**Application No.:** 10/034,425

telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Shaheen et al.

By   
Michael L. Berman  
Registration No. 51,464

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.  
United Plaza, Suite 1600  
30 South 17th Street  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-6400  
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

MLB/ml  
Enclosure